Forensic Entomology as Evidentiary Reconstruction in Criminal Investigations: Scientific Reliability, Environmental Variability, and the Judicial Interpretation of Insect Evidence

Sergio Pommier Gallo, PhD
Stanford University
ORCID: 0009-0000-7387-3943
Web of Science ResearcherID: QDO-1840-2026

Abstract

Forensic entomology occupies a distinctive position within contemporary criminological and forensic investigation because insects associated with human remains can preserve information that becomes unavailable through conventional medico-legal examination as decomposition progresses. Although the discipline is commonly associated with estimation of the postmortem interval, its evidentiary function extends to species identification, reconstruction of environmental circumstances, detection of concealment, interpretation of decomposition, and, in appropriate circumstances, entomotoxicological investigation. This article examines forensic entomology as an evidentiary reconstruction discipline rather than merely a technique for calculating time since death. It employs qualitative doctrinal legal research, comparative forensic analysis, and interdisciplinary criminological analysis to evaluate the conditions under which insect-derived evidence can contribute reliably to criminal investigations and judicial proceedings. Particular attention is given to the distinction between postmortem interval, minimum postmortem interval, time of colonization, and period of insect activity; environmental variability; species identification; sampling and preservation; entomotoxicological effects; molecular identification; and the communication of uncertainty in expert testimony. Existing literature demonstrates that environmental conditions, insect biology, geographical variation, toxicological exposure, concealment, and methodological assumptions can materially influence interpretation. The article argues that the principal legal challenge is not whether entomological evidence is scientifically admissible in principle, but whether the particular inference offered in a criminal case is traceable to adequately documented observations, validated methods, appropriate environmental information, and scientifically expressed uncertainty. Forensic entomology should therefore be

treated as a structured evidentiary reconstruction capable of contributing significant information to criminal investigations while remaining subject to methodological limitations, multidisciplinary corroboration, and judicial scrutiny.

Keywords

Forensic entomology; criminal investigation; postmortem interval; time of colonization; insect evidence; entomotoxicology; forensic science; death investigation; expert evidence; criminology; decomposition; molecular identification.

Introduction

Forensic entomology constitutes one of the most distinctive intersections between biological science and criminal investigation. Its evidentiary object is unusual: insects and other arthropods whose biological relationship with decomposing remains can provide information concerning events surrounding death. The discipline is most frequently associated with postmortem interval estimation, but contemporary forensic entomology encompasses a broader range of investigative questions, including species identification, decomposition reconstruction, environmental assessment, concealment, movement of remains, and the detection of certain toxicological influences.

Recent scholarship confirms both the importance and the complexity of the field. A 2025 systematic review described forensic entomology as increasingly relevant to postmortem interval estimation, species identification, crime-scene reconstruction, and the detection of drugs and poisons, while simultaneously identifying environmental variation, insect behavior, concealment, and standardization as persistent limitations.

The discipline therefore presents a particularly important problem for criminology and criminal law. Biological evidence can appear highly objective because insects develop according to biological processes rather than human testimony. Yet the inference drawn from those biological processes is not automatic. It depends upon assumptions concerning temperature, species, developmental stage, access to the body, geographic ecology, substrate, toxicological exposure, and the timing of colonization.

The National Institute of Justice has documented the continuing scientific debate concerning exactly what forensic entomology estimates. The distinction between

postmortem interval, minimum postmortem interval, and other temporal concepts is not merely terminological. It reflects different inferential propositions and different assumptions about what the entomological evidence can establish.

This distinction has direct legal significance.

A court does not simply need to know whether insects were present. It must determine what proposition those insects reliably support. A statement that a body was colonized by a particular species is fundamentally different from a statement that death occurred within a particular temporal interval. The latter requires additional inferential steps.

Forensic entomology consequently should not be conceptualized exclusively as a "clock." It is more appropriately understood as an evidentiary reconstruction system in which biological observations are translated into constrained propositions concerning events surrounding death.

This article develops that proposition without introducing a new forensic theory. It applies established scientific literature and forensic principles to a criminological and legal analysis of evidentiary reliability.

The research focuses on the conditions under which entomological evidence can contribute meaningfully to criminal investigations while preventing scientific conclusions from exceeding their methodological foundation.

Research Question

How should forensic entomological evidence be interpreted and incorporated into criminal investigations so that biological observations concerning insects and decomposition produce scientifically reliable and legally defensible evidentiary conclusions?

Three subsidiary questions follow:

1. What distinguishes postmortem interval estimation from related temporal concepts such as minimum postmortem interval and time of colonization?
2. How do environmental, biological, geographic, and toxicological variables affect the reliability of entomological reconstruction?

3. What methodological and evidentiary safeguards are necessary when entomological findings are presented as expert evidence in criminal proceedings?

Hypothesis

The principal hypothesis is that forensic entomological evidence is most reliable when it is treated as a multidimensional reconstruction rather than as a simple temporal measurement.

The reliability of the conclusion depends upon the interaction of species identification, developmental biology, environmental conditions, scene documentation, sampling and preservation, and the precise inferential proposition communicated by the expert.

A secondary hypothesis is that judicial reliability increases when forensic entomologists explicitly distinguish observed entomological facts from temporal or causal inferences and communicate uncertainty through scientifically appropriate ranges and limitations rather than categorical conclusions unsupported by the available evidence.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework combines forensic science, criminology, and evidentiary theory.

Forensic science transforms physical or biological traces into propositions relevant to an investigation. Criminology provides the broader framework within which those propositions acquire investigative significance. Criminal procedure determines how specialized scientific knowledge is tested and evaluated by legal institutions.

Forensic entomology is particularly suitable for interdisciplinary analysis because the biological phenomenon is objective while the evidentiary inference is interpretive.

The presence of a larval population is an observation.

The identification of the species is a scientific interpretation based upon morphological, molecular, or other analytical methods.

The estimation of developmental age is a further inference.

The conversion of that developmental estimate into an interval relevant to death requires environmental and biological assumptions.

The conclusion that the estimated interval establishes when the criminal act occurred represents an additional inferential step that may exceed the scientific evidence.

This progression demonstrates why forensic entomological evidence must be analyzed in layers.

Postmortem Interval and Related Temporal Concepts

The traditional expression "postmortem interval" can obscure the precise nature of the evidence.

Forensic entomological analysis may involve:

- postmortem interval (PMI);
- minimum postmortem interval (minPMI);
- time of colonization (TOC);
- preappearance interval;
- period of insect activity; and
- developmental age of collected insects.

These concepts are not interchangeable.

The scientific literature has expressly debated whether forensic entomology can estimate PMI or only a minimum PMI. Wells argued that succession analysis can, under appropriate conditions, contribute to an estimate of PMI rather than being conceptually restricted to a minimum interval.

Other literature has emphasized that the terminology should reflect the assumptions embedded within the analysis. Tarone and Sanford identified the long-standing debate over what forensic entomologists actually estimate and emphasized the importance of recognizing assumptions rather than allowing them to remain implicit.

This debate is theoretically significant because it demonstrates that forensic reliability depends partly upon linguistic precision.

An expert who reports a developmental age of insects is not necessarily reporting the exact time of death.

The scientific proposition must be defined before the legal institution can determine its evidentiary weight.

Methodology

This article employs qualitative doctrinal legal research, comparative forensic analysis, and interdisciplinary criminological analysis.

The doctrinal component examines the relationship between specialized forensic evidence and criminal investigation, focusing on reliability, expert reasoning, evidentiary limitations, and judicial evaluation.

The comparative forensic component evaluates established scientific literature concerning insect development, succession, species identification, environmental influences, postmortem interval estimation, and entomotoxicology.

The criminological component considers the practical function of entomological evidence in homicide investigation, clandestine disposal of remains, delayed discovery, concealment, and reconstruction of events surrounding death.

The study is normative rather than experimental. No original biological experiments or independent statistical models are presented. The article instead synthesizes verified scientific literature and evaluates the implications of existing forensic knowledge for criminal justice.

The methodology deliberately avoids constructing an autonomous theory of forensic entomology. Its purpose is to clarify the evidentiary structure already present within the discipline and identify the conditions under which its conclusions can be appropriately incorporated into criminal proceedings.

Results and Legal Analysis

1. Forensic Entomology as Reconstruction Rather Than Measurement

The first finding is that forensic entomology should be conceptualized as reconstruction.

Insects do not function as clocks in the conventional mechanical sense. Their development and colonization respond to biological and environmental conditions. Consequently, the forensic practitioner reconstructs a temporal or environmental proposition from biological traces.

This reconstruction is particularly valuable when conventional indicators of early death have become unreliable.

Traditional postmortem indicators such as body temperature, rigor mortis, and livor mortis have relatively limited temporal utility as decomposition progresses. Earlier forensic literature emphasized that insect development and species succession can extend the investigative temporal window substantially beyond the earliest postmortem period.

The evidentiary advantage therefore lies in the persistence of biological information.

Even after extensive decomposition, insect evidence may remain available for analysis.

But persistence does not eliminate uncertainty.

It creates a different evidentiary problem: reconstructing the environmental and biological history that produced the observed insect population.

2. Species Identification as a Foundational Requirement

Species identification represents a foundational stage of entomological analysis.

Different species possess different developmental rates, ecological preferences, seasonal patterns, and geographical distributions. An incorrect identification can consequently affect the entire temporal inference.

Historically, morphological identification has been central to forensic entomology. Molecular methods increasingly provide complementary or confirmatory approaches.

Contemporary research indicates that DNA-based techniques can improve the identification of forensically relevant insects, particularly when morphological characteristics are difficult to evaluate. Recent reviews identify molecular taxonomy and DNA barcoding among important developments in forensic entomology.

The legal consequence is that species identification should not be treated as an incidental preliminary observation.

It constitutes part of the scientific foundation of subsequent inference.

Where species identification is uncertain, the temporal conclusion should reflect that uncertainty.

3. Environmental Variability

Environmental variability is among the most significant limitations affecting forensic entomology.

Temperature influences insect development. Humidity, substrate, sunlight, shade, rainfall, geographic location, accessibility of the remains, and surrounding ecological conditions may also affect colonization and decomposition.

Research concerning seasonal carrion communities demonstrates substantial variation in insect taxa and community composition across seasons. One NIJ-supported study found differences in richness and relative abundance across seasonal conditions and decomposition stages, illustrating the importance of environmental variation when succession evidence is used for postmortem analysis.

The consequence is straightforward.

A developmental model derived under one set of environmental conditions cannot automatically be treated as universally applicable.

The evidentiary strength of an entomological estimate therefore depends upon the degree to which the case environment corresponds to the assumptions of the analytical model.

This is particularly important in jurisdictions with pronounced climatic variation.

A model developed in one geographic region may not provide equivalent inferential reliability in another region without appropriate validation.

Recent systematic analysis of forensic entomology research involving human cadavers has identified limited geographic representation as an important research gap. The same review identified developmental biology, taxonomy, molecular identification, and succession as major research clusters while emphasizing continuing limitations in geographical diversity and methodological coverage.

4. Colonization and Access to the Remains

The presence of insects on remains does not necessarily establish the moment of death.

Colonization depends upon access.

Clothing, wrapping, burial, environmental barriers, indoor confinement, water, containers, vehicles, vegetation, and other forms of concealment can alter or delay insect access.

This creates an important distinction between the time of death and the time at which insects were able to colonize the remains.

In forensic terms, the evidence may therefore support a proposition concerning insect activity rather than directly establish the moment of death.

This distinction becomes especially relevant in homicide cases involving concealment.

Criminal offenders may attempt to conceal remains precisely because concealment alters the evidentiary environment. Burial and other concealment mechanisms can influence decomposition and insect access. The literature specifically identifies post-burial interval estimation as a distinct area of forensic entomology because burial can alter the biological conditions under which insects interact with remains.

For criminology, this creates an important investigative function.

Entomological evidence may contribute not only to temporal reconstruction but also to determining whether the remains experienced environmental conditions inconsistent with the apparent discovery scene.

5. Sampling and Preservation

The reliability of forensic entomology is also dependent upon evidence collection.

Insects may be collected at different developmental stages. Some specimens should be preserved while others may require live collection for developmental assessment. Environmental conditions must be documented. Relevant temperature histories may need to be reconstructed. The location of specimens on or around the remains can also be significant.

A cold-case review demonstrates the consequences of inadequate preservation. In that case, entomological evidence collected during an earlier investigation had been poorly preserved. Later investigators nevertheless extracted additional information through molecular and morphological approaches. The case illustrates both the resilience of entomological evidence and the consequences of inadequate initial preservation.

The legal lesson is important.

Evidence preservation is not a technical administrative detail. It directly influences the possibility of independent verification.

If specimens are improperly preserved, an opposing expert may be unable to replicate or adequately evaluate the original analysis.

This affects procedural fairness as well as scientific reliability.

6. Development-Based Analysis

Development-based methods use the biological development of insects to infer temporal information.

The age of immature insects can be estimated through developmental stages, size, morphology, and temperature-dependent growth models.

The scientific literature recognizes substantial variation, particularly during later developmental stages. Research on blowfly development has demonstrated that developmental rates can vary and that temperature is a major component of the analytical model.

The consequence is that developmental estimation should not be communicated as though insect growth were perfectly uniform.

The scientific model produces an estimate within defined assumptions.

The court should therefore be provided with the assumptions necessary to understand the estimate.

7. Succession-Based Analysis

Succession analysis differs from development-based analysis.

Instead of primarily examining the age of an individual insect, succession analysis considers the sequence of insect communities associated with decomposition.

Different species may become associated with remains at different stages of decomposition.

This can provide information concerning longer intervals than some developmental methods.

Research has demonstrated that necrophagous insect communities differ across decomposition stages and environmental conditions.

Yet succession evidence is similarly dependent upon ecological context.

Geographical variation, seasonality, habitat, and access to remains can influence which species appear and when they appear.

Consequently, succession analysis should be interpreted through appropriate regional and environmental knowledge rather than treated as a universally fixed biological sequence.

8. Entomotoxicology

Entomotoxicology provides another dimension of forensic entomology.

Insects feeding on decomposing remains may encounter drugs, poisons, or other chemical substances present in tissues.

These substances can sometimes be detected through analysis of insect material, particularly when conventional biological tissues have substantially decomposed.

Recent literature identifies entomotoxicology as an expanding area of forensic investigation while emphasizing that toxicants may also alter insect development and therefore potentially influence postmortem estimates.

This creates a dual evidentiary relationship.

A toxic substance may be detectable through insect evidence.

At the same time, the substance may influence the biological process used to estimate time since death.

The analytical implications are therefore complex.

An expert should consider whether toxicological exposure could have affected insect development before relying upon developmental estimates.

9. Molecular Forensic Entomology

Molecular techniques have expanded the capabilities of forensic entomology.

DNA analysis can assist species identification, particularly where morphological characteristics are degraded or ambiguous.

Recent reviews identify molecular taxonomy and DNA-based approaches as important developments in the discipline.

The legal significance of molecular confirmation is substantial because species identity may constitute a foundational assumption in developmental models.

Nevertheless, molecular identification does not eliminate the need for contextual analysis.

Knowing the species does not automatically establish its developmental age, environmental history, colonization time, or relationship to the precise moment of death.

Molecular certainty at one analytical stage cannot be converted into certainty at every subsequent stage.

10. Artificial Intelligence and Computational Models

Computational approaches are increasingly relevant to forensic entomology.

Recent literature identifies machine learning and computational modeling as emerging tools for species identification and forensic analysis.

Their introduction creates both opportunities and legal questions.

A computational model may process complex environmental and biological variables more efficiently than traditional approaches.

However, computational sophistication does not automatically establish forensic validity.

A model used in criminal proceedings must still be understood in terms of its training data, validation, applicable population, environmental assumptions, error characteristics, and limitations.

The legal principle should therefore remain consistent with the broader forensic framework: technological complexity cannot substitute for evidentiary transparency.

An algorithm that produces a temporal estimate without an intelligible explanation of its underlying assumptions may create a new form of opacity rather than solving an existing reliability problem.

11. Expert Evidence and Judicial Evaluation

Forensic entomological evidence is ultimately translated into legal language through expert testimony.

The expert should explain:

- what specimens were collected;
- where they were collected;
- how they were preserved;
- how species were identified;
- which developmental or succession model was used;
- what environmental data were available;
- which assumptions were required;
- what temporal interval was estimated;
- what alternative explanations exist; and
- what the evidence cannot establish.

This structure allows the court to distinguish scientific evidence from legal conclusion.

The distinction is particularly important because forensic entomology may be presented in criminal trials as though it establishes a precise moment of death.

Scientific literature does not support such universal precision.

A 2013 analysis specifically examined forensic entomology through the perspective of the Daubert standard and emphasized the need for reliability and accuracy when entomological PMI estimates are introduced into legal proceedings.

The central judicial question should therefore not be whether insects can provide information about decomposition.

They clearly can.

The question should be whether the specific inference offered in the case is adequately supported.

12. Evidentiary Reconstruction and Criminal Investigation

Forensic entomology has an important criminological function because it can contribute to reconstruction beyond the temporal dimension.

Insects may provide information concerning:

- whether remains were accessible to colonization;
- whether concealment occurred;
- whether environmental conditions changed;
- whether the body may have been moved;
- whether decomposition occurred in more than one environment;
- whether toxicological exposure may have affected insect development; and
- whether the scene presented conditions inconsistent with an asserted chronology.

These questions can assist investigators in constructing competing hypotheses.

The value of forensic entomology is therefore greatest when it is integrated with other evidence rather than isolated.

Scene investigation, forensic pathology, toxicology, DNA analysis, anthropology, digital evidence, witness testimony, and environmental reconstruction may each provide independent information.

Entomological evidence can function as a component within this evidentiary network.

13. The Principle of Scientific Restraint

The strongest conclusion emerging from the analysis is the importance of scientific restraint.

Scientific restraint does not mean minimizing the value of forensic entomology.

It means matching the conclusion to the evidence.

If species identification is certain but developmental conditions are uncertain, the temporal inference should reflect that difference.

If environmental temperature data are incomplete, the uncertainty should be disclosed.

If the body was concealed, the possibility of delayed colonization should be addressed.

If toxicological exposure is suspected, its potential effect on development should be considered.

If specimens were inadequately preserved, the limitations should be stated.

Such transparency strengthens rather than weakens forensic evidence.

It allows the court to evaluate the actual evidentiary contribution instead of confronting an artificially absolute conclusion.

Discussion

The analysis demonstrates that forensic entomology should be understood as a specialized form of evidentiary reconstruction situated at the intersection of biology, criminology, forensic science, and criminal procedure.

Its principal value does not arise from an assumption that insects provide a perfectly calibrated biological clock.

Its value arises because insects interact systematically with decomposition and environmental conditions, creating traces that may preserve information about events surrounding death after conventional postmortem indicators become less useful.

This scientific value is nevertheless conditional.

The literature consistently identifies environmental variation, species identification, developmental biology, sampling, preservation, toxicological effects, and methodological standardization as significant factors affecting interpretation.

The legal system should therefore avoid two opposite errors.

The first is scientific overstatement: treating entomological evidence as capable of establishing a precise fact that the method cannot establish.

The second is scientific underestimation: dismissing entomological evidence merely because it produces probabilistic or interval-based conclusions.

Both approaches are inadequate.

Criminal justice routinely operates with scientific evidence characterized by uncertainty. The appropriate question is whether the uncertainty is understood, quantified where possible, communicated accurately, and integrated with other evidence.

The distinction between observation and inference should remain central.

The observation that a particular insect species and developmental stage were recovered from remains may be scientifically robust.

The inference concerning the developmental age of the insects may be more conditional.

The inference concerning colonization may be still more conditional.

The inference concerning the exact time of death may require additional assumptions.

The inference concerning the time of a criminal act may require further evidence altogether.

This layered structure provides a rational framework for judicial evaluation.

Forensic entomology should consequently be regarded as a form of **evidentiary reconstruction with graduated inferential strength**.

The further the conclusion moves from directly observed biological evidence toward ultimate criminal conclusions, the more explicit the assumptions and corroborating evidence should become.

The same principle applies to emerging technologies.

Molecular identification can improve taxonomic confidence.

Machine learning can improve classification.

Computational models can process environmental variables.

None of these technologies eliminates the need for validation and transparent interpretation.

The increasing technological sophistication of forensic entomology therefore strengthens the need for methodological discipline rather than reducing it.

Limitations

This study is doctrinal and interdisciplinary and does not constitute an experimental validation study.

It does not establish new developmental models, calculate independent error rates, or test species-specific models across geographical regions.

The article also does not attempt to establish a universal judicial admissibility standard because evidentiary law differs across jurisdictions.

The analysis is consequently directed toward general principles of scientific reliability and evidentiary interpretation rather than a jurisdiction-specific admissibility test.

Further empirical research is necessary to improve regional validation, human-cadaver research, standardized environmental modeling, entomotoxicological interpretation, and computational validation.

Recent systematic research itself identifies geographic representation and entomotoxicology as areas requiring further development.

Conclusions

Forensic entomology represents an important and increasingly sophisticated branch of forensic science with substantial relevance to criminology and criminal investigation.

Its value extends beyond the traditional conception of postmortem interval estimation.

Insect evidence may contribute to species identification, decomposition reconstruction, environmental assessment, concealment analysis, entomotoxicology, and multidisciplinary reconstruction of events surrounding death.

The central conclusion is that forensic entomology should be treated as **evidentiary reconstruction rather than simple temporal measurement**.

The reliability of an entomological conclusion depends upon a chain of scientific conditions: accurate species identification, appropriate sampling and preservation, reliable environmental information, valid developmental or succession models, recognition of toxicological influences, and transparent communication of uncertainty.

The distinction between postmortem interval, minimum postmortem interval, time of colonization, and period of insect activity is therefore fundamental.

Scientific literature has demonstrated that these concepts cannot safely be treated as interchangeable.

Environmental variation represents another central limitation.

Temperature, season, geographic location, habitat, concealment, accessibility, and other factors may affect insect development and succession.

The legal implication is that entomological evidence should be evaluated according to the precise scientific proposition supported by the evidence rather than according to the general reputation of the discipline.

A qualified expert does not eliminate methodological uncertainty.

A sophisticated analytical technique does not eliminate environmental variability.

A molecular identification does not automatically establish a temporal conclusion.

An algorithmic model does not eliminate the need for validation.

The appropriate judicial approach is therefore one of calibrated evidentiary interpretation.

Forensic entomology can make significant contributions to criminal investigations precisely because its biological traces may preserve information that becomes unavailable through other forensic methods. Its legitimacy is strengthened when experts

clearly identify what the evidence demonstrates, what it supports inferentially, and what remains uncertain.

The discipline should consequently be integrated into criminal justice through multidisciplinary corroboration, transparent methodology, scientifically appropriate temporal ranges, rigorous evidence preservation, and clear separation between forensic findings and ultimate legal conclusions.

Such an approach does not diminish the authority of forensic entomology.

It establishes the conditions under which that authority can be scientifically credible and legally defensible.

References

Amendt, J., Campobasso, C. P., Gaudry, E., Reiter, C., LeBlanc, H. N., & Hall, M. J. R. (2007). Best practice in forensic entomology—Standards and guidelines. *International Journal of Legal Medicine, 121*, 90–104.

Bansode, S., et al. (2025). Challenges and considerations in forensic entomology: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*.

Benbow, M. E., Lewis, A. J., Tomberlin, J. K., & Pechal, J. L. (2013). Seasonal necrophagous insect community assembly during vertebrate carrion decomposition. *Journal of Medical Entomology, 50*(2), 440–450.

Obafunwa, J. O., Roe, A., & Higley, L. (2025). A review of the estimation of postmortem interval using forensic entomology. *Medicine, Science and the Law, 65*(1), 52–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/00258024241275893

Picard, C. J., Deblois, K., Tovar, F., Bradley, L. J., Johnston, J. S., & Tarone, A. M. (2013). Increasing precision in development-based postmortem interval estimates: What's sex got to do with it? *Journal of Medical Entomology, 50*(2), 425–431.

Singh, J., Kumar, A., Trivedi, S., & Pandey, S. K. (2025). Advancements in estimating post-mortem interval in medico-legal practice: A comprehensive review. *Legal Medicine, 75*, 102627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.legalmed.2025.102627

Singh, R., Sharma, S., & Sharma, A. (2016). Determination of post-burial interval using entomology: A review. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 42*, 37–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2016.05.004

Tarone, A. M., & Sanford, M. R. (2017). Is PMI the hypothesis or the null hypothesis? *Journal of Medical Entomology, 54*(5), 1109–1115.

Wells, J. D. (2019). A forensic entomological analysis can yield an estimate of postmortem interval, and not just a minimum postmortem interval: An explanation and illustration using a case. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 64*(2), 634–637. https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13912

Xie, D., Peng, Y.-L., Guo, Y.-D., & Cai, J.-F. (2013). Reflection of estimating postmortem interval in forensic entomology and the Daubert standard. *Fa Yi Xue Za Zhi, 29*(4), 290–294.

INTERPOL. (2023). *Disaster victim identification guide*. International Criminal Police Organization.

National Institute of Justice. (2017). *Forensic entomology overview*. U.S. Department of Justice.